



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/768,401	01/30/2004	Michele Borgatti	02AG38953426	3793
27975 7590 09/19/2007 ALLEN, DYER, DOPPELT, MILBRATH & GILCHRIST P.A. 1401 CITRUS CENTER 255 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE P.O. BOX 3791 ORLANDO, FL 32802-3791			EXAMINER COLEMAN, ERIC	
			ART UNIT 2183	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

creganoa@addmg.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/768,401

Applicant(s)

BORGATTI ET AL.

Examiner

Eric Coleman

Art Unit

2183

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-12, 14-17, 19-22, 24-26, 28-31 and 33-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 13, 18, 23, 27, 32 and 36 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 10,11,14,17, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over of Bocchi (patent No. 6,845,276)(cited in the last office action) in view of Brown (IEEE article entitled FPGA and CPLD Architectures: A tutorial) in view of Iwata (patent No. 6,662,314)(cited in last office action).

3. Bocchi taught the invention substantially as claimed including a data processing "DP") system comprising: (as per claims 10,):

4. a) Processing unit (10) (e.g., see fig. 1) comprising microprocessor (66) embedded flash memory (62) for non-volatile storage of code, and data (e.g., see col. 5, lines 5-25) comprising a FPGA port (e.g., see fig. 1), direct memory access channel route between Flash memory and FPGA or SRAM via CPLD), connected to a field programmable gate array (64) and the SRAM (68) , direct memory access channel comprising and interface (CPLD) connected to a FPGA port and a port of the flash memory (62) (e.g., see fig. 1). Bocchi did not expressly detail that the FPGA was an SRAM embedded FPGA. Brown taught that FPGA embedded FPGAs where SRAM emedded FPGA are programmable (e.g., see page 53, column 1 and table1 on page 45) and the FPGA current commercial products (as of summer 1996) use either SRAM

or antifuse technologies (e.g., see page 45, col. 1). Since SRAM was commercially available and reprogrammable one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to utilized SRAM for the FPGA (e.g., see col. 10, lines 14-25).

5. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of Bocchi and Brown. Both references were directed toward the problems of implementing systems using CPLD and FPGA and SRAMs. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate the Bocchi teachings of the commercially available FPGA technologies along with the capabilities of each at least to provide for the low cost quick and efficient implementation of the Bocchi teachings.

6. As per claims 10, Bocchi did not expressly detail that SRAM (6) embedded FPGA, CPU, controller and Flash memory all integrated on a single chip. Iwata taught this limitation with the microprocessor (CPU 3) embedded flash memory (5) for non-volatile storage of code, and data (e.g., see col. 10, line 53-col. 11, line 20) comprising a port, direct memory access channel (7) controllers (7,8), SRAM (6) all integrated on a single chip (e.g., see fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 46-63).

7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the DP art to combine the teachings of Bocchi and Iwata. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate the Iwata teaching of placing the CPU, SRAM, Flash, Controller on the same chip into the Bocchi system to reduce system size and cost.

8. Bocchi taught the CPLD operated as a Direct memory access channel and the FPGA was connected to the FPGA port of the flash memory through the CPLD (that comprised that operated as a DMA channel) (e.g., see fig. 1, and col. 4, line 51-col. 5,

Art Unit: 2183

line 32)[the CPLD performs interfacing with memory even when CPU is disabled (e.g., see col. 9, line 55-col. 10, line 28].

9. On the other hand, one of ordinary skill would have connected the FPGA port and the FPGA interface to the DMA port to at least to provide a means to load the Flash memory from external memory such as from the host's memory.

10. As to the limitations of claim 11, Bocchi taught the flash memory having a data port (connected to data bus e.g., see fig. 1) and code port (e.g., see fig. 1). Further lwata taught each DMA channel comprised a DMA controller (e.g., see col. 4 lines 46-63). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that the DMA channel of lwata was able to handle transfers of streams of bits while the microprocessor performed other operations including fetching data and instructions from the SRAM or Flash memory bus (9) (e.g., see fig. 1)(e.g., see col. 1, line 55-col. 2, line 53).

11. As to claims 14, Bocchi taught the code port of the embedded Flash memory is for optimizing random access time [at least in that separate code and data ports allow concurrent transfer of code and data] and an application system supported by the reconfigurable processing unit[the processor allows for an application to be processed by an optimized system that is reconfigured to the application]; the data port of the embedded Flash memory is for allowing access to application data for modification thereof[the data port of the flash memory is connected to data bus and CPU for processing and modification of data] ; and the FPGA port of the embedded Flash memory is for providing serial access for downloading the bit streams for an embedded FPGA configuration (e.g., see fig. 1).

Art Unit: 2183

12. As per claim 17, Iwata taught a system bus connected to the DMA channel (7) and the embedded flash memory (5) e.g., see fig. 1).

13. Claims 19,21,24,28,30,33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bocchi (patent No. 6,845,276) in view of Brown (IEEE article entitled FPGA and CPLD Architectures: A tutorial).

14. Bocchi taught the invention substantially as claimed including a data processing "DP") system comprising: (as per claims 19,20,21,28,29,30):

15. a) Processing unit (10) (e.g., see fig. 1) comprising microprocessor (66) embedded flash memory (62) for non-volatile storage of code, and data (e.g., see col. 5, lines 5-25) comprising a FPGA port (e.g., see fig. 1), direct memory access channel (route between Flash memory and FPGA or SRAM via CPLD), connected to a field programmable gate array (64) and the SRAM (68), direct memory access channel comprising an interface (CPLD) connected to a FPGA port and a port of the flash memory (62) (e.g., see fig. 1). Bocchi did not expressly detail that the FPGA was an SRAM embedded FPGA. Brown taught that FPGA embedded FPGAs where SRAM embedded FPGA are programmable (e.g., see page 53, column 1 and table 1 on page 45) and the FPGA current commercial products (as of summer 1996) use either SRAM or antifuse technologies (e.g., see page 45, col. 1). Since SRAM was commercially available and reprogrammable one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to utilize SRAM for the FPGA (e.g., see col. 10, lines 14-25 of Bocchi).

Art Unit: 2183

16. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of Bocchi and Brown. Both references were directed toward the problems of implementing systems using CPLD and FPGA and SRAMs. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate the Bocchi teachings of the commercially available FPGA technologies along with the capabilities of each at least to provide for the low cost and quick implementation of the Bocchi teachings.

17. Bocchi taught the CPLD operated as a Direct memory access channel and the FPGA was connected to the FPGA port of the flash memory through the CPLD (that comprised that operated as a DMA channel) (e.g., see fig. 1, and col. 4, line 51-col. 5, line 32)[the CPLD performs interfacing with memory even when CPU is disabled (e.g., see col. 9, line 55-col. 10, line 28].

18. On the other hand, one of ordinary skill would have connected the FPGA port and the FPGA interface to the DMA port to at least to provide a means to load the Flash memory from external memory such as from the host's memory.

19. Bocchi taught the flash memory having a data port (connected to data bus e.g., see fig. 1) and code port (e.g., see fig. 1). Further Iwata taught each DMA channel comprised a DMA controller (e.g., see col. 4 lines 46-63). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that the DMA channel of Iwata was able to handle transfers of streams of bits while the microprocessor performed other operations including fetching data and instructions from the SRAM or Flash memory bus (9) (e.g., see fig. 1)(e.g., see col. 1, line 55-col. 2, line 53).

Art Unit: 2183

20. As to claims 24,33 Bocchi taught the code port of the embedded Flash memory is for optimizing random access time [at least in that separate code and data ports allow concurrent transfer of code and data] and an application system supported by the reconfigurable processing unit[the processor allows for an application to be processed by an optimized system that is reconfigured to the application]; the data port of the embedded Flash memory is for allowing access to application data for modification thereof[the data port of the flash memory is connected to data bus and CPU for processing and modification of data] ; and the FPGA port of the embedded Flash memory is for providing serial access for downloading the bit streams for an embedded FPGA configuration (e.g., see fig. 1).

21. Claims 20,29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bocchi and Brown as applied to claims 19, 28 above, and further in view of Iwata (patent No. 6,662,314).

22. As per claims 20,29, Bocchi did not expressly detail that SRAM (6) embedded FPGA, CPU, controller and Flash memory all integrated on a single chip. Iwata taught this limitation with the microprocessor (CPU 3) embedded flash memory (5) for non-volatile storage of code, and data (e.g., see col. 10, line 53-col. 11, line 20) comprising a port, direct memory access channel (7) controllers (7,8), SRAM (6) all integrated on a single chip (e.g., see fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 46-63).

23. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the DP art to combine the teachings of Bocchi and Iwata. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to

Art Unit: 2183

incorporate the Iwata teaching of placing the CPU, SRAM , Flash , Controller on the same chip into the Bocchi system to reduce system size and cost.

24. Claims 12, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwata, Brown and Bocchi as applied to claims 10, 11, above, and further in view of Stancil and Kuo (both cited in the last office action).

25. Stancil taught a flash memory (204, 308) comprising a modular array on N modules and power memory arbiter (304) (e.g., see fig. 3)

26. As per claim 12, Stancil taught the Flash memory (e.g., see col. 8, lines 19-37) comprising modular array of memory modules (e.g., col. 7, line 12-col. 8, line 57). Also Kuo taught a flash memory comprising a charge pump (38) (e.g., fig. 3 and paragraph [0026]).

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Iwata and Stancil. Both references were directed to the problems of systems that use embedded flash memories. One ordinary skill in the DP art would have been motivated to incorporate the arbiter to provide better communication between the flash memory and a plurality of system components.

28. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Iwata and Kuo. Both references were directed to the problems of systems that use embedded flash memories. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate the charge pump of Kuo at least to stabilize voltage levels when a flash

Art Unit: 2183

memory is embedded on a chip with other elements (e.g. see paragraphs 0010-0015 of Kuo).

29. Claims 22,31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown and Bocchi as applied to claims 19-21,24,28-30,33 above, and further in view of Stancil and Kuo (both cited in the last office action).

30. Stancil taught a flash memory (204,308) comprising a modular array on N modules and power memory arbiter (304) (e.g., see fig. 3)

31. As per claims 22,31 Stancil taught the Flash memory (e.g., see col. 8, lines 19-37) comprising modular array of memory modules (e.g., col. 7, line 12-col. 8, line 57). Also Kuo taught a flash memory comprising a charge pump (38) (e.g., fig. 3 and paragraph [0026]).

32. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Bocchi and Stancil. Both references were directed to the problems of systems that use embedded flash memories. One ordinary skill in the DP art would have been motivated to incorporate the arbiter to provide better communication between the flash memory and a plurality of system components.

33. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Bocchi and Kuo. Both references were directed to the problems of systems that use embedded flash memories. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate the charge pump of Kuo at least to stabilize voltage levels when a flash

Art Unit: 2183

memory is embedded on a chip with other elements (e.g. see paragraphs 0010-0015 of Kuo).

34. Claims 15,16, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwata, Brown and Bocchi and Brown as applied to claims 10,11,14, above, and further in view of Blemel (patent No. 6, 938,177)(cited in the last office action).

35. Blemel taught a EEPROM of Flash memory for programming a FPGA (e.g., see col. 3, lines 1-25). Therefore one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to provide plural registers for input and output to/from the FLASH memory to adjust for the speed difference between the processing portion and the memory portion of the system.

36. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Iwata and Blemel. Both references were directed to the problems of systems that use embedded flash memories. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to add the Blemel FPGA to provide reconfigurable processing to optimize processing of applications.

37. As to the use of a chip select and burst enable signal (claim 16) the use of these signals to access memory was well known in the art at the time of the claimed invention. Therefore one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to access data using serial and burst access depending on the speed requirements of the transmission of data.

38. Claims 25,26,34,35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown and Bocchi as applied to claims 19-21,24,28-30,33 above, and further in view of Blemel (patent No. 6, 938,177)(cited in the last office action).

Art Unit: 2183

39. Blemel taught a EEPROM of Flash memory for programming a FPGA (e.g., see col. 3, lines 1-25). Therefore one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to provide plural registers for input and output to/from the FLASH memory to adjust for the speed difference between the processing portion and the memory portion of the system.

40. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Bocchi and Blemel. Both references were directed to the problems of systems that use embedded flash memories. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to add the Blemel FPGA to provide reconfigurable processing to optimize processing of applications.

41. As to the use of a chip select and burst enable signal (claim 16) the use of these signals to access memory was well known in the art at the time of the claimed invention. Therefore one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to access data using serial and burst access depending on the speed requirements of the transmission of data.

Allowable Subject Matter

42. Claims 13,18,23,27,32,36, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/6/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks Applicant argues in substance that: One of ordinary skill would not selectively modify The Bocchi reference in view of the Brown and Iwata to produce the claimed invention and Applicant alleges that Bocchi does not disclose the FPGA 64 is to be reconfigurable. The Examiner contends that the arguments for selectively modifying the references are detailed in the outstanding rejection (repeated above). As to the FPGA being reconfigurable an FPGA such as taught by Bocchi is a field programmable gate array and is reconfigurable and also Bocchi taught that the FPGA was reconfigured (e.g., see col. 10, lines 14-46 of Bocchi)

Applicant alleges that Bocchi did not teach that even though the FPGA receives application data from the FLASH memory via the CPLD is not for reconfiguring the FPGA. The Examiner however contends that Bocchi taught programming code for the FPGA 64 is downloaded to the Flash memory through a programming port and code for the FPGA 64 is loaded from the flash memory 62 programming the FPGA with certain logic functions (e.g., see col. 5, lines 5-32). The programming of the field programmable gate array is done by reconfiguring the gate array. Note: the CPLD is the interface between the Flash memory and the FPGA.

Applicant argues that while the Brown article discloses an SRAM associated with a FPGA one of skill in the art would not be motivated to selectively incorporate such a device into a controller as disclosed in Bocchi so that the SRAM embedded FPGA is to be reconfigured. The Examiner contends as stated in the argument above

Art Unit: 2183

that the Bocchi system downloads programming code to the flash memory that is the loaded into the FPGA that programs the FPGA by reconfiguring the FPGA. The use of a SRAM embedded FPGA would have been performed for the reasons stated in the outstanding rejection above.

Applicant argues that the Iwata patent does not teach modifying the Bocchi patent for replacing the FPGA with an S-RAM embedded FPGA is to be reconfigured. Also Applicant alleges that the Examiner is using impermissible hindsight reconstruction of the Bocchi, Brown and Iwata references. The Examiner contends that the Bocchi taught a reconfigurable device namely field programmable gate array that is programmed via program code that is downloaded to a Flash memory and then loaded into the FPGA (e.g., see col. 5, lines 5-32). This provides for the reprogramming and reconfiguration operation of the system whenever that host downloads programming code to the flash memory. The repeated programming of the FPGA would have yielded predictable results. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate an S-RAM embedded FPGA at least for the reasons stated in the outstanding rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2183


mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric Coleman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4163. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Chan can be reached on (571) 272-4162. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

EC



ERIC COLEMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER